

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 remain in the present application. Claims 4-8 have been canceled.

Applicants wish to point out that independent claim 1 of the present application has been amended so as to further clarify the hardware reconfigurability of the method by including the method step, "providing that the computer have an FPGA hardware structure which may be physically reconfigured."

The Examiner again rejected, in particular, independent claim 1 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,857). Such claim was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,088) in view of Tang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,370). For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

To summarize, none of the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination with each other, teach or suggest, nor even contemplate, a method whereby the physical hardware structure of a computer may be configured.

Indeed, the Nelson reference merely discloses a computer system 1 having a persistent memory area 9 which is configurable only from a functional or software standpoint. As the Examiner even noted, the Nelson reference discloses a set of network driver codes which are downloaded from a master computer to a configurable embedded computer system. Applicants respectfully submit that such reconfiguration is only directed toward the software of the associated network computer, not the physical hardware. Nelson only teaches, as even noted in lines 14-16 of the second numbered paragraph "1" of the Office Action, putting new software components into a network computer in order to replace old software components. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Nelson fails as a prima facie reference for the §102(a) rejection.

Similarly, the Li reference merely discloses an Internet access device which is able to automatically configure itself for communications with the Internet using information contained in a configuration record. Li teaches to download configuration data in the form of Internet and network settings to reconfigure the respective Internet access device. However, as only software settings are transmitted, such configuration data transmitted according to Li again only relates to

software data, not any reconfigurable hardware data. Along the same lines, the Tang reference is absolutely silent with respect to the reconfiguration of the hardware of a network computer.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest configuration data which includes both a hardware portion and a software portion as proposed in amended independent claim 1 of the present application. Again, all such references merely teach the reconfiguration/substitution of software, not hardware.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 of the present application, as amended, as well as claims 2-3 which respectfully depend therefrom, are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

It is further submitted that no fees are due in connection with this response at this time. However, if any fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0114543-002) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

William E. Vaughan

Reg. No. 39,056

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4292

Dated: January 19, 2005